

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/087,013

Applicant(s)

SCHERF ET AL.

Examiner

Zachariah Lucas

Art Unit

1648

All Participants:

(1) Zachariah Lucas.

(2) Nancy W. Vensko.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 12 December 2003

Time: _____

Type of Interview:



Telephonic



Video Conference



Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

21, 57-59

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

32
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called to clarify that the Gamain et al. document submitted in the November 2003 IDS was a post-filing publication (it had not yet been published), and to ask for permission to make an Examiner Amendment to make the following changes to the claims:

in claim 21, the article - - an- - would be inserted between the terms "or" and "immunogenic" in line 2 of the claim.

in claim 57, in the phrase "is the immunogenic fragment" in line two of the claim, the article "the" would be replaced by the article - - an- - to clarify that the claim reads on any of the claimed fragments, rather than on a specific fragment.

in claim 58, in the phrase "is the immunogenic fragment" in line two of the claim, the article "the" would be replaced by the article - - an- - for the same reason as indicated above with respect to claim 57.

in claim 59, the claim would be amended by inserting the term - -one- - between the words "any" and "of" in the phrase "any of Claims 12, 56, 57, and 58" such that the claim would depend from these claims in the alternative only. .